

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Formal drawings were submitted with a mailing date of April 14, 2004. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16, 17 and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,627,333. Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer disclaiming any portion of a patent issuing on the present invention that would extend beyond the terms of U.S. Patent No. 6,627,333. The Terminal Disclaimer is believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-45 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,524. Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer disclaiming any portion of a patent issuing on the present invention that would extend beyond the terms of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,524. The Terminal Disclaimer is believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-16 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-35 of co-pending Application No. 10/780,436. Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer disclaiming any portion of a patent issuing on the present invention that would extend beyond the terms of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/780,436. The Terminal Disclaimer is believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-8, 10, 11, and 14-16 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16, 17 and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,627,333. Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer disclaiming any portion of a patent issuing on the present invention that would extend beyond the terms of U.S. Patent No. 6,627,333. The Terminal Disclaimer is believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-5 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 8, 10-13, 23-25, and 33-36 of co-pending Application No. 10/838,665. Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer disclaiming any portion of a patent issuing on the present invention that would extend beyond the terms of U.S. Application No. 10/838,665. The Terminal Disclaimer is believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-8, 10, 11, and 14-16 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 8, 10-13, 23-25, and 33-36 of co-pending Application No. 10/838,665. Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer disclaiming any portion of a patent issuing on the present invention that would extend beyond the terms of U.S. Application No. 10/838,665. The Terminal Disclaimer is believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-8, 10, 11, and 14-16 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, 14-16-18, 27-30 of co-pending Application No. 10/869,115. Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer disclaiming any portion of a patent issuing on the present invention that would extend beyond the terms of U.S. Application No. 10/869,115. The Terminal Disclaimer is believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention.

By this amendment the term “more effectively matches” in claim 1 has been deleted. Claim 1 will be briefly reviewed. Claim 1 requires a white light reproducing OLED device that has a color filter array having at least three separate filters for passing red, green and blue light respectively. Applicants have recognized that by selecting the composition of one or more dopants in the emission layers the white emission spectrum can be changed so that it corresponds to the bandpass spectra of the red, and blue filters. The Examiner’s attention is turned to Fig. 3 which shows the prior art where there are red, green and blue filters and Fig. 5 which shows a change in the white emission spectrum so that the blue and red filters correspond to this emission spectrum. Unexpected results occur. There is an improvement in the color gamut which is illustrated in Fig. 6 when compared to Fig 4 (prior art). The area of the triangle 170 is greater than the area of triangle 160 which illustrates that there is improved color gamut.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 102(e) as being anticipated by Hatwar . Claims 1-16 were rejected under 102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative under 103 as obvious over Hatwar.

Turning first to Hatwar '333, which discloses a white light emitting device, rubrene is used as the dopant for the layer adjacent to the light emitting layer which emits yellow-red light. Fig. 8 shows a spectrum which somewhat corresponds to the spectrum of Fig. 3 of the present application. Although, Hatwar '333 uses color filters the spectrum of the white light has not been changed to correspond to the bandpasses of the blue and red filters. Clearly, one skilled in the art would find no motivation in Hatwar "333 for the subject matter set forth in claim 1 of the present application. As noted above, the present invention provides improved gamut results. These results are believed to be unexpected.

Hatwar '524 was published on March 3, 2005 and issued April 5, 2005. 35 USC 102(e) is only applicable if the invention was described in a granted patent before the invention by applicants themselves. Therefore, the rejection under 103 is inappropriate.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. (US Pub. No. 2001/0043168).


In paragraph 008, it does say that a white emitting layer can be doped. Paragraphs 185 and 224 you mentioned a red color emitting layer, a blue color emitting layer and a green color emitting layer. There is nothing in this reference which suggests or provides any motivation for element d) of claim 1 which requires "the composition of one or more of the dopants being selected to change the spectrum of the white light to be compatible with the spectrum of the color filters by having peak responses in the white light spectrum corresponding to the bandpass spectra of the red and blue color filters." As discussed above, this provides a significant improvement in color gamut. Applicants can not find any teaching, disclosure or suggestion in Koyama et al. for element d). There is no discussion of gamut improvement or of dopant selection to change a white light emitting spectrum to correspond to blue and red color filters. Accordingly it is believed that claim 1 defines patentable subject matter over Koyama et al.

The remaining claims in this case all depend upon claim 1 and therefore should be allowed along with claim 1.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/djw  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-477-4653  
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.